DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 557 CS 012 668

AUTHOR DeGroff, Linda
TITLE Perceptions of Roles and Relationships in the School Library: A National Survey of Teachers, Administrators, and Library Media Specialists. Reading Research Report No. 72.
INSTITUTION National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.; National Reading Research Center, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 97
CONTRACT 117A20007
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Elementary Education; Information Sources; *Interprofessional Relationship; Librarians; *Librarian Teacher Cooperation; *Library Role; Library Services; Library Surveys; *Media Specialists; National Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study examined the role of the school library media specialist; how that role is perceived by teachers, administrators, and the librarians themselves; and how teachers and librarians forge working relationships. According to a policy document issued by two professional societies, the school ibrary media specialist serves three roles: information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. A 161-item forced-choice survey, answered by 148 literacy professionals from elementary schools across the United States, revealed perceptions of the school library media specialists' roles, and insights into how teachers and librarians communicate and work together. Findings indicate that: the school library media specialists' role is highly valued; today's school library media specialist regularly practices the roles of information specialist and teacher; teachers and the school library media specialist work together in casual rather than systematic ways; and human qualities are most important for supporting good working relationships between teachers and the school library media specialist. (Contains 16 references and 6 tables of data. The survey instrument is attached.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 402 557

Perceptions of Roles and Relationships in the School Library: A National Survey of Teachers, Administrators, and Library Media Specialists

Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 012668

NRRC
National Reading Research Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 72
Winter 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

Perceptions of Roles and Relationships in the School Library: A National Survey of Teachers, Administrators, and Library Media Specialists

Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 72
Winter 1997

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Center Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NRRC National Reading Research Center

Executive Committee
Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia
John F. O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd
University of Georgia
Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia
Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives
Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, *University of Georgia*
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos
Shawn M. Glynn, *University of Georgia*

NRRC Staff
Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager
Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary
University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant
Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board
Phyllis W. Aldrich
Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Saratoga Springs, New York
Arthur N. Applebee
State University of New York, Albany
Ronald S. Brandt
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Marshá T. DeLain
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Barbara McCombs
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (MCREL)
Luis C. Moll
University of Arizona
Carol M. Santa
School District No. 5
Kalispell, Montana
Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education
Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Rutgers University
Peter Winograd
University of Kentucky

Production Editor
Katherine P. Hutchison
University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator
Jordana E. Rich
University of Georgia

Text Formatter
Angela R. Wilson
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia
318 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678
INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625
INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach
University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee
University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen
University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi
University of Buffalo–SUNY

Patty Anders
University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington
University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning
University of Utah

Jill Bartoli
Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer
University of Georgia

Janet Benton
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum
Pine Springs Elementary School
Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome
Vanderbilt University

John Borkowski
Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd
University of Georgia

Karen Bromley
Binghamton University

Martha Carr
University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley
Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras
University of Georgia

Linda Cooper
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello
Connecticut Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham
Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl
Ohio State University

Marcia Delany
Wilkes County Public Schools
Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico
California State University-S[illegible]
Bernardino

Mark Dressman
New Mexico State University

Ann Duffy
University of Georgia

Ann Egan-Robertson
Amherst College

Jim Flood
San Diego State University

Dana Fox
University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell
University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham
McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Frances Hancock
Concordia College of Saint Paul,
Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach
Virginia Commonwealth University

Sally Hudson-Ross
University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd
University of Georgia

Gay Ivey
University of Georgia

David Jardine
University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez
University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly
University of Utah

James King
University of South Florida

Kate Kirby
Georgia State University

Linda Labbo
University of Georgia

Michael Law
University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu
Syracuse University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
Fourth Street Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
Auburn University

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College-CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
California State University-
Sacramento

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
Barnett Shoals Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
Boise State University

Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research
and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University-Billings

Louise Waynant
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver
Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallie Yopp
California State University

About the Author

Linda DeGroff is an Associate Professor in the Department of Language Education at the University of Georgia where she teaches classes in children's literature and language arts methods. Prior to doing graduate work at Syracuse University, she taught first grade for 12 years. Her recent research has involved surveying and interviewing diverse literacy professionals about their work and ways of knowing.

National Reading Research Center
Universities of Georgia and Maryland
Reading Research Report No. 72
Winter 1997

Perceptions of Roles and Relationships in the School Library: A National Survey of Teachers, Administrators, and Library Media Specialists

Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Abstract. *This study examined the role of the school library media specialist; how that role is perceived by teachers, administrators, and the librarians themselves; and how teachers and librarians forge working relationships. The definition of the school library media specialist's role was taken from* Information Power, *a policy document of AASL and AECT. According to this document the school library media specialist serves three roles: information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. A 161-item, forced-choice survey, answered by 148 literacy professionals from across the United States, revealed perceptions of the school library media specialist's roles, and insights into how teachers and librarians communicate and work together. Findings indicate that: the school library media specialist's role is highly valued; today's school library media specialist regularly practices the roles of information specialist and teacher; teachers and the school library media specialist work together in casual rather than systematic ways; and human qualities are most important for supporting good working relationships between teachers and the school library media specialist.*

What is the role of the school library media specialist? How is that role in its ideal perceived by teachers, administrators, and the librarians themselves? How does the ideal compare to actual practice? How do teachers and librarians forge working relationships? How do they communicate? What supports effective partnerships between these literacy professionals?

In recent years, two things happened which caused me to become increasingly interested in these questions. I have wanted to know more about how we (I count myself among teachers of reading and language arts) perceive school library media specialists and form effective working relationships with them.

The first experience that sparked my curiosity came when I taught a 10-week staff development course on children's literature for a nearby school district. I developed plans for the course after meeting with the approximately 30 participants to assess their interests and needs. What they clearly wanted were opportu-

nities to get acquainted with more children's books. But after a few weeks, I noticed that the teachers were not making use of the host librarian's offerings or the resources from their own school libraries. So I suggested that we might use one of our sessions for an "idea exchange" with the library media specialists from all their schools. We would invite the librarians to a special session in which we would hold a conversation about shared and unique interests. The staff development participants declined my offer to arrange such a meeting. And at the end of our work together, I was still left with the feeling that something needed to be done to bring teachers and librarians together. I began to wonder how teachers perceived their libraries and librarians.

The second happening occurred shortly after my work in the staff development course. *Language Arts* was published as a themed issue about "Libraries and Language Arts." When I first saw the issue, I thought, "at last—here's what I'm looking for." And while I value that issue of *Language Arts*, I was struck by the editor's letter to the journal's readers. In it, Bill Teale says, "I must admit to being a bit discouraged by the overall pool of manuscripts we received.... In any case it certainly suggests that there is much room for an increased role for librarians in the overall effort at language arts education in the 1990s" (Teale, 1990, p. 729).

Well, I must admit I was a bit discouraged, too. It seemed to me that the *Language Arts* community might be somewhat like those teachers from the staff development course who were not getting to know their libraries and librarians.

As I said above, these experiences made me want to know more and to see what I might do to inform other literacy educators of the roles that the school library media specialist might play in literacy programs. From there I began to plan the exploratory study that is reported here.

The purpose of this study was to explore literacy professionals' (teachers, administrators, and librarians) perceptions of the role of the school library media specialist in literacy programs. That exploration began with a look at the literature from two domains—the librarian's and the reading and language arts teacher's. Literature from the first domain helped me get to know about the role of the library media specialist in its ideal. Literature from the second domain helped me begin to appreciate the importance and nature of effective working relationships between librarians and teachers.

Getting to Know the School Library Media Specialist

Getting to know today's school library media specialist requires getting to know *Information Power*. *Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* was developed by the American Association of School Librarians and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (1988). It is a comprehensive document that defines the school library and the work of the library media specialist in both philosophical and practical terms. Several articles that summarize and highlight key points from *Information Power* have proved helpful in understanding the document and, of course, the library

media specialist's role (Barron & Bergen, 1992; Stripling, 1989; Walker, 1988; Watkins & Craft, 1988; Whitney, 1988).

Chapter 3 of *Information Power*, "The School Library Media Specialist: Roles and Responsibilities," is central to the purposes for this study. This chapter sets out the librarian's role as three interdependent and equally important roles (Walker, 1988).

The first role, that of the *information specialist*, seems most familiar to me as I think back to the libraries and librarians I have known over the years. When taking on the information specialist's role, the librarian provides access and resources, gives assistance with locating information, guides selection, develops flexible policies and schedules, and maintains accurate and efficient systems for locating information.

The *teacher* role is the second of the three roles. *Information Power* explains that the librarian is responsible for teaching both children and adults—the school's teachers and the parents of the children. Among the content and skills to be taught are critical reading and thinking skills, understanding of freedom of information in a democracy, and respect for first amendment rights, copyright, privacy, and other laws. In addition, it is in the teacher role that the library media specialist promotes lifelong learning and an appreciation for reading and learning.

The third role is that of *instructional consultant*. In this role the librarian offers guidance and advice to teachers about curriculum, instruction, and assessment. It is the librarian's goal in this role to see that information skills are integrated into the content areas rather than taught in isolation.

As I studied these descriptions of the three roles, I was struck by the breadth of the library media specialist's work and wondered if one could possibly do it all. Walker (1988), however, explains that "Previous standards have often set unclear and unrealistic expectations. This is not the case with *Information Power*. In some school districts library media specialists already meet these role expectations effectively...." (p.23). One of the purposes of the present study was to ask others if they concur with Walker's assertion. In other words, how do these ideal roles as documented in *Information Power* compare with literacy professionals' (teachers, administrators, and library media specialists) perceptions of roles? And, how do ideal role compare with what takes place in the challenging world of actual practice?

Getting to Know About Teacher and Librarian Relationships

Information Power gives us an "official" description of the library media specialist's role, a sense of what that role might be in the ideal. Another body of literature focuses on relationships between teachers and librarians historically, theoretically and in real practice.

My reading of this literature tells me that I am not alone in wondering about how well we know our library media specialists and how teachers and librarians form good relationships. In their review of the literature, Bell and Totten (1992) note that previous research shows "low levels of instructional cooperation

in general between library media specialists and classroom teachers" (p. 83). Templeton (1990), in his historical look at relationships concludes that over time teachers and librarians have been like "two shy children in the schoolyard, each wishing fully to involve the other in common plan and purpose but usually making, at best, tentative overtures" (p. 776).

The stage has been set for knowing about each other and working together. Whole language and other approaches that call for increased uses of children's literature are credited with making the need for those "tentative overtures" more pressing (Gold, Greengrass, & Kulleseid, 1992; Thomas & Goldsmith, 1992, for example). Several accounts illustrate how teachers and librarians have forged working relationships in whole language schools.

Hansen (1987) described the impact of changes in the reading and writing programs on the school library and librarian at the Mast Way School in New Hampshire. Hansen found that access to the library was critical to the success of the instructional programs, that teachers became more curious and knowledgeable about books, and that the librarian engaged in supporting response to literature. She reported, however, that the main change was in the atmosphere in the library that reflected new relationships between classrooms, teachers, and the library.

Library media specialists worked with classroom teachers in whole language classrooms in Florida schools described by Lamme and Ledbetter (1990). In those cases, the librarians reportedly functioned across the full range of roles detailed in *Information Power*, serving as information specialists, teachers, and instructional consultants.

In a study of four whole language schools in Virginia and North Carolina, Hughes (1993) noted an impact on the collection of books and materials in the library, as well as an impact on the librarian's role. She found librarians engaged in a wide range of roles—as traditional providers of resources, as literature consultants, and, finally, as cooperative planners with teachers. Hughes found that teachers, however, were still not making use of the library.

These studies and others leave us with suggestions for how teachers and librarians may work together. Dales (1990) makes a case for developing "trusting relationships" between teachers and library media specialists. She notes that teachers and librarians have similar goals for their students; but as professionals, they seem to have "separate agendas" for working with students. Dales (1990) cautions that "when teachers and librarians disagree, one response is for teachers not to utilize the library" (p. 733). To avoid this, she proposes that librarians view themselves more as teachers, and that teachers view the libraries as classrooms.

Sounding a note similar to Dales' (1990), Montgomery (1992) asks that "in the interest of students, both teachers and librarians must relinquish some control and share their expertise. Such behavior requires mutual respect, a solid sense of self-esteem, and control over the specific subject matter or skill being taught" (p. 530). Montgomery also notes that communication is "both the key to success and a stumbling block" in maintaining good relationships.

Knowing about each other's role, establishing trust and respect, and communicating—are we doing these? How? This study raises these questions and looks for answers through a national survey of literacy professionals—teachers, administrators, and library media specialists. The study asks, How is the library media specialist's ideal role perceived? How is that role carried out in reality? How do teachers and librarians communicate and work together? What facilitates or impedes good relationships?

Methods

Materials

Materials for the study included a 161-item, forced-choice survey and an open-ended questionnaire. The survey was divided into six parts. The first part was for gathering demographic information. This part was different for the library media specialists, the teachers, and the administrators who were to serve as respondents. The other five parts were identical for all respondents. The second part of the survey presented 16 statements of belief about literacy teaching, learning and programs. The third part presented 48 statements about the perceived importance of the library media specialist's three roles (information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant) as defined in the "ideal" by *Information Power*. The fourth part repeated the same statements, but asked for ratings on how these roles were being carried out in reality. The fifth part asked for ratings on 18 items about how teachers and librarians communicate, cooperate, and collaborate. And the sixth part asked for ratings on 31 items about what facilitates or impedes relationships. A copy of the survey is found in Appendix A.

The open-ended questionnaire asked two broad questions: (a) What is the role of the library media specialist in the reading instruction program of your classroom and/or school?, and (b) What changes would you make in the library-media program in order to improve or strengthen it? These questions were asked so that literacy professionals might speak about roles in their own voices. Responses to the questionnaire are used to extend and illustrate survey data.

Procedures

Approximately 10 days before the survey was mailed, advance notice letters were sent to library media specialists at 150 elementary schools around the United States. The librarians' names and addresses were randomly selected from a national data base of educators purchased from Market Data Retrieval. In the advance letter, the librarians were told they would receive four copies of the survey and would be asked to give a copy of the survey to a building administrator, a primary-grade teacher and an intermediate-grade teacher. To help choose, I suggested they ask colleagues who would be most willing to complete the survey and to choose teachers who were "active users of children's literature." Reminder letters were mailed approximately 3 weeks after the surveys were mailed. Surveys were mailed for a second time about 4 weeks after the reminder letters were sent. Two sets of the survey were undeliverable because of errors in

the mailing addresses. That left a total number of 148 schools and 592 individuals as possible respondents to the survey. Completed surveys were received from 148 individuals (25% of total possible respondents) at 57 schools (38% of the total possible schools). Specifically, they were 47 librarians, 29 administrators and 72 teachers. The open-ended questionnaire was mailed 4 weeks later to participants who volunteered their names and addresses. Sixteen questionnaires were returned.

Respondents

One way to characterize the respondents to the survey is by examining data about the schools in which they work. The 148 respondents worked in 57 schools scattered across the nation. Twelve (21%) of those schools were described as urban, 14 (25%) as suburban, and 31 (54%) as rural or small town. Of these schools, 40 (70%) were elementary schools which included most of the grades between Pre-K and sixth; 3 (5%) were primary schools with no grades above third; 7 (12%) were intermediate schools with no grades below fourth; and 7 (12%) were comprehensive schools with grades between Pre-K or K and eighth or twelfth. The schools were of a variety of sizes. Ten (18%) were small schools with 250 or fewer students; 19 (33%) had 251–500 students; 15 (26%) had 501–750; and 13 (23%) were large schools with enrollments above 750. In terms of racial or ethnic makeup, the schools were skewed toward having low proportions of "minority" students. Thirty-two (56%) of the schools had from 0–25% minority students attending; 13 (23%) had minorities ranging from 26–50%; 5 (9%) had 51–75% minority enrollments; and 4 (8%) had minority enrollment greater than 75%.

Another way to represent the respondents is to look at their experiences as educators. On average, the respondents might be described as "seasoned veterans." Of the 72 teachers, only 5 had taught for fewer than 5 years; while 29 had taught for more than 20 years. The mean number of years taught by the 72 teachers was 16. Likewise, the 27 administrators were highly experienced. None had been educators for fewer than 5 years; while 19 had worked in the profession for more than 20 years. Together, they had worked in the profession for a mean of 23 years. Somewhat different data were collected from the library-media specialists. To begin, they were asked if they were certified. Only 5 of the 47 librarians responding lacked certification, and they had worked in their positions for relatively few years. Of the remaining 42 librarians, 2 received certification in the 1960s; 16 in the 1970s; 13 in the 1980s, and 10 in the 1990s. Eleven received certification after 1988, the year in which *Information Power* was published. It seems reasonable to assume that these 11 would be well informed about *Information Power*; whereas, the degree of familiarity with that document for the remaining librarians may depend on their links to professional organizations and publications. When asked about membership in national professional organizations such as the American Library Association, a little more than half (26 of the 47 librarians) indicated such involvement. A few other librarians wrote notes about their membership in state-level

organizations. Unfortunately, that information was not collected from all respondents.

A final way to understand the respondents is by looking at their stances toward literacy. To do this, respondents were asked to rate 16 statements of belief on a 5-point scale ranging from "disagree" to "agree." All but the first two of these statements (see Table 1) were intended to reflect beliefs consistent with what might be characterized as a holistic, literature-based stance toward literacy.

The library media specialists, teachers, and administrators agreed with survey statements about how to foster literacy development, about literacy program goals, and about the importance of inquiry and family involvement. Agreement with these statements suggests that the survey participants tend to value children's literature and holistic or literature-based practices.

The mean ratings for items about skills and strategies were somewhat lower (ranging from 2.50 to 4.02). The item that mentioned specific materials other than children's literature such as basal readers for teaching skills and strategies received the lowest rating in this set of items. The means ratings, however, are not conclusive. The standard deviations were high for these items (*SD* ranging from .79 to 1.40), indicating there was low consensus among survey respondents on how to teach skills and strategies.

In sum, it seems that those who answered the survey share beliefs about reading and consider reading children's literature to be important for meeting goals. It seems reasonable then to believe that the participants would be disposed to valuing the library and its services.

Results

The Library Media Specialist in Ideal and Real Roles

How do literacy professionals view the library media specialist's role in the ideal? Do they value the role as it is described in *Information Power*? And, how does the role in its ideal compare to what librarians do in real, daily practice? In order to answer these questions, the survey included items about each of the three roles—information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant—as specified in *Information Power*. The items represented the three roles, but the labels for the roles were not included in the survey. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item to the library media specialist's role first in the ideal and later to the frequency of practice in reality.

In the role of information specialist. Seventeen items described the role of the information specialist. Respondents were asked to rate importance of these items on a scale from 1 to 5. As might be expected, respondents rated all of the items describing the information specialist's role as ideally important (see Table 2). In other words, respondents believe it is important that librarians support flexible scheduling and policies for access; share books, resources, and information; select new materials; and know about children, books, teaching and learning, for example.

When looking at results in terms of the three positions of the respondents, we see that

Table 1
Beliefs about Literacy Teaching, Learning, and Programs

Indicate the extent to which you disagree (1) or agree (5):	LMS Mean (*SD*)	TCH Mean (*SD*)	ADM Mean (*SD*)
Reading skills and strategies are best learned through use of materials specifically designed for those purposes—basal readers, phonics kits, etc.	2.77 (1.05)	2.77 (1.15)	2.50 (1.40)
Reading skills and strategies are best taught through direct instruction.	3.38 (1.13)	3.35 (0.93)	3.57 (1.32)
Reading skills and strategies are best learned while reading children's literature, trade books, library books, etc.	4.02 (0.87)	4.00 (0.96)	4.00 (0.82)
Reading skills and strategies are best taught through demonstrations, for example, mini-lessons at the start of a reading workshop.	3.53 (1.18)	3.93 (0.95)	3.89 (0.79)
Literacy development is enhanced by reading aloud to children in all grades.	4.91 (0.28)	4.90 (0.34)	4.90 (0.31)
Literacy development is enhanced when children discuss their reading with peers and adults.	4.83 (0.38)	4.85 (0.36)	4.90 (0.31)
Literacy development is enhanced when reading materials relate to children's interests.	4.81 (0.45)	4.93 (0.26)	4.83 (0.47)
Literacy development is enhanced when children choose their own reading materials.	4.38 (0.74)	4.18 (0.88)	4.31 (0.71)
Literacy development is enhanced when children have time in school for reading.	4.79 (0.41)	4.74 (0.56)	4.79 (0.49)
Literacy development is enhanced when children read voluntarily outside of school.	4.89 (0.31)	4.92 (0.28)	4.90 (0.31)
Promoting enjoyment of reading literature is an important goal of a literacy program.	4.87 (0.34)	4.94 (0.23)	4.86 (0.35)
Promoting voluntary reading is an important goal of a literacy program.	4.87 (0.34)	4.89 (0.36)	4.86 (0.35)
Promoting critical reading and thinking is an important goal of a literacy program.	4.74 (0.49)	4.79 (0.44)	4.79 (0.41)
Promoting lifelong reading is an important goal of a literacy program.	4.96 (0.20)	4.93 (0.26)	4.90 (0.41)
Inquiry methods, activities, and experiences enhance critical reading and thinking.	4.79 (0.46)	4.68 (0.58)	4.69 (0.47)
Family involvement enhances literacy development.	4.89 (0.31)	4.92 (0.28)	4.86 (0.35)

Table 2
In the Role of Information Specialist

How unimportant (1) or important (5) are the following roles for the library media specialist?	Ideal Role			Actual Role		
	ADM	LMS	TCH	ADM	LMS	TCH
	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)
Supports flexible scheduling throughout school day	4.79 (0.57)	4.70 (0.62)	4.31 (1.07)	4.00 (1.35)	3.26 (1.50)	3.87 (1.44)
Supports flexible scheduling beyond school day	4.14 (1.15)	3.67 (1.46)	3.31 (1.60)	2.96 (1.82)	2.30 (1.59)	2.51 (1.67)
Supports flexible scheduling for small groups and whole classes	4.71 (0.53)	4.70 (0.66)	4.36 (1.03)	3.68 (1.70)	3.43 (1.49)	3.75 (1.47)
Shares books, resources, and services	4.86 (0.36)	4.47 (1.00)	4.42 (1.02)	4.12 (0.97)	3.46 (1.22)	4.22 (1.06)
Shares information about new materials	4.82 (0.48)	4.43 (1.00)	4.38 (1.01)	4.28 (0.79)	3.28 (1.20)	4.17 (1.19)
Participates in selecting new materials	4.93 (0.26)	4.23 (0.98)	4.44 (0.80)	4.76 (0.52)	3.19 (1.12)	3.42 (1.23)
Seeks input from children and colleagues when selecting new materials	4.89 (0.42)	4.13 (1.03)	4.22 (1.02)	3.72 (1.02)	2.82 (1.23)	3.34 (1.39)
Makes materials from other libraries available	4.75 (0.52)	2.67 (1.48)	3.08 (1.46)	3.20 (1.63)	2.02 (1.20)	2.30 (1.35)
Actively seeks and promotes funding	4.46 (1.14)	3.67 (1.35)	3.25 (1.38)	3.32 (1.70)	2.49 (1.44)	2.38 (1.32)
Assists children and colleagues in selecting and locating books	4.89 (0.42)	3.43 (1.26)	4.00 (4.06)	4.68 (0.69)	2.81 (1.23)	3.78 (1.18)
Assists children and colleagues in locating information	4.93 (0.26)	3.39 (1.20)	4.06 (1.12)	4.64 (0.70)	3.13 (1.26)	3.72 (1.21)
Assists children in developing systematic modes of inquiry	4.43 (0.79)	4.33 (0.90)	4.60 (0.67)	3.56 (1.26)	3.91 (0.94)	4.11 (1.08)
Knows needs, skills, interests, and abilities of children	4.07 (0.98)	4.91 (0.28)	4.93 (0.26)	3.68 (0.90)	4.57 (0.74)	4.83 (0.41)
Applies knowledge about teaching and learning	4.46 (0.84)	4.91 (0.28)	4.92 (0.28)	3.46 (1.14)	4.68 (0.66)	4.76 (0.49)
Is knowledgeable of range of books and materialize for readers	4.96 (0.19)	4.17 (0.85)	4.44 (0.69)	4.62 (0.71)	3.57 (0.85)	4.01 (0.78)
Supports flexible policies to ensure maximum and equal access	4.82 (0.48)	4.40 (0.96)	4.24 (1.08)	4.08 (1.10)	3.80 (1.16)	4.14 (1.06)
Uses accurate and efficient systems for locating resources and information	4.89 (0.31)	4.31 (0.85)	4.10 (1.14)	4.42 (0.78)	3.33 (1.03)	3.92 (1.10)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the administrators consistently place higher value on the information specialist items than do the librarians or teachers. Two items show the greatest discrepancy among positions. The value that administrators place on the librarian's role in making materials available from other libraries (M = 4.75) is noticeably higher than that of the librarians (M = 2.67) or the teachers (M = 3.08). Also, the value that administrators place on the librarian's role in assisting children and colleagues in locating information (M = 4.93) is noticeably higher than that of librarians (M = 3.39).

Survey responses indicated that while in the role of information specialist, librarians work in reality comes quite close to the expressed ideal. Respondents were asked to rate the same items as were rated for the ideal, but this time they were to indicate how often the library media specialist took on this role in actual practice during the 1994–95 school year. Items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from never to regularly.

In terms of rating actual performance, librarians were their toughest critics; they almost always gave the lowest ratings of their practices. On the other hand, just as administrators rated the value of practices in the ideal, they also gave the highest ratings to the librarians on actual practice. In sum, administrators expect a lot from librarians as information specialists and believe that they are getting what they require.

Responses to the open-ended questionnaire often described the librarian in the role of information specialist. In describing the library media specialist at one school, a survey respondent wrote,

> At the present, she provides book check, story time, library-media skills for students, "Reading is Fundamental" program—(4x's a year), supports Book-It, has a student book exchange section, allows students to come to the library for research, study, quiet reading, filmstrip viewing, reading big books, story-telling etc. She assists students and teachers in locating materials and stays current on new trends in the classroom reading instruction.

One library media specialist touched on the matter of making materials from other libraries available. She said, "New teachers as well as our veterans do not have an understanding of the library's role or the vast resources available both inhouse and beyond our walls."

In the role of library-media teacher. The next nine items in the survey explored the role of teaching in the library-media program. Again, each item describing that role was judged to be ideally important for the librarian (see Table 3). Respondents believed that the librarian should teach children how to select books, resources, and information; should promote and support lifelong reading and critical reading; should teach appreciation for the freedom of information, respect for First Amendment rights and copyright laws; and should teach parents techniques for reading with children. For the most part, respondents' ratings by position were consistently high on the items about valuing the role of the library media specialist as teacher. In other words, there was little difference in the high ratings among administrators, librarians, and teachers.

Actual practices of library media specialists in the role of teacher again were close, but still

Table 3
In the Role of Library-Media Teacher

How unimportant (1) or important (5) are the following roles for the library media specialists?	Ideal Role			Actual Role		
	ADM	LMS	TCH	ADM	LMS	TCH
	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)
Teaches children how to select and locate books, resources, and information	4.89 (0.31)	4.96 (0.20)	4.90 (0.42)	4.75 (0.61)	4.81 (0.45)	4.77 (0.61)
Teaches colleagues how to select and locate books, resources, and information	4.86 (0.45)	4.87 (0.40)	4.89 (0.43)	4.42 (0.83)	4.34 (0.96)	4.33 (1.16)
Teaches parents and adults how to select and locate books, resources, and information	4.54 (0.79)	4.40 (0.99)	4.49 (0.86)	3.00 (1.44)	3.38 (1.39)	3.45 (1.57)
Promotes and supports lifelong reading and learning	4.96 (0.19)	4.94 (0.25)	4.96 (0.26)	4.58 (0.78)	4.79 (0.55)	4.77 (0.61)
Promotes and supports critical reading and thinking	4.61 (0.74)	4.77 (0.52)	4.76 (0.52)	3.79 (1.18)	4.32 (0.91)	4.24 (1.07)
Teaches appreciation for freedom of information	4.54 (0.69)	4.68 (0.66)	4.50 (0.87)	3.79 (1.14)	4.13 (1.01)	4.06 (1.14)
Teaches understanding and respect for First Amendment rights	4.54 (0.69)	4.38 (0.92)	4.11 (1.14)	3.46 (1.32)	3.91 (1.14)	3.66 (1.27)
Teaches understanding and respect for copyright, privacy, and other laws	4.71 (0.60)	4.79 (0.51)	4.81 (0.49)	4.04 (1.37)	4.32 (0.98)	4.36 (0.98)
Teaches parents and others techniques for reading with children	4.29 (1.01)	4.34 (0.96)	4.43 (0.93)	2.87 (1.26)	3.06 (1.33)	3.13 (1.50)

somewhat less than, the ideal. Three items were noticeably lower in real as compared to ideal ratings. One of these items addressed teaching about First Amendment rights. The other two items referred to teaching parents how to select and locate books and techniques for reading with their children. Standard deviations on these three items were particularly high, indicating a low consensus among survey respondents.

Unlike results with items on the library media specialist in the role of information specialist where the administrators gave the highest ratings about practices, the administrators' ratings were the lowest among the three positions on items about the role of library

media teacher. And the lowest ratings among the administrators addressed items about the practices of teaching parents how to select and locate books and techniques for reading with their children.

Responses to the open-ended questionnaire did not address the role of teacher as often as the role of information specialist. When this role was addressed it was usually in terms of helping children with their research. For example, one respondent wrote, "She helps students with their research by helping them know where to look for information." Another wrote, "She plans small group instruction for our children to introduce and enhance research skills (encyclopedia, dictionary, CD-ROM, etc.)." This same respondent also noted the librarian's role in promoting and supporting reading and learning by writing, "She constantly reads to the children to motivate and encourage enjoyment of reading." No one commented about teaching understanding or appreciation for freedom of information, First Amendment rights, or copyright and privacy laws.

One library media specialist called upon teacher educators to make their students more aware of the librarians' role of teacher by saying, "Some [new teachers] do not realize that we are also teachers who have taken many of the same courses while also specializing in resources and researching."

In the role of instructional consultant. Seven items ended the survey section on roles by exploring the role of the instructional consultant. Responses to this set of items differed from the other sets (see Table 4). Mean responses to items about the information specialist and teacher roles were all above 4.0, but mean responses to items about the instructional consultant role ranged from 3.35 to 4.79. In other words, this role was rated as important but not as important as the other two roles. It was considered most important that the librarian participate in designing curriculum and instructional strategies, and in integrating skills and in gathering books. But, it was considered to be less important that the librarian engage in other unit experiences such as selecting topics, developing plans, carrying out plans, and assessing experiences.

In addition to lower mean ratings for importance on this set of items, the standard deviations were higher than with the sets on the other two roles. Certainly, there was less agreement about the importance of the role of instructional consultant.

Teachers valued the role of instructional consultant less than the other respondents did. They most valued the library media specialist's help in selecting books for unit experiences; but placed less value on the librarian's help in planning, implementing, and assessing unit experiences.

Just as the ideal importance of the library media specialist serving in the instructional consultant role was lower in comparison to the other two roles, so were the ratings for carrying out this role in actual practice. Only the item on gathering books for units received a mean rating of greater than 4.0. Three items received mean ratings of less than 3.0 revealing practices that seldom take place. These items tell us that librarians seldom participate in developing unit plans (M = 2.83), carrying out unit plans (M = 2.94), or assessing unit plans (M = 2.35).

Table 4
In the Role of Instructional Consultant

How unimportant (1) or important (5) are the following roles for the library media specialist?	Ideal Role			Actual Role		
	ADM	LMS	TCH	ADM	LMS	TCH
	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)	Mean (*SD*)
Participates in designing literacy curriculum and instructional strategies	4.32 (0.90)	4.45 (0.75)	4.41 (0.84)	2.96 (1.27)	2.98 (1.52)	3.35 (1.46)
Ensures information skills are integrated in content areas	4.04 (1.10)	4.53 (0.80)	3.96 (1.07)	3.42 (1.10)	3.83 (1.34)	3.44 (1.44)
Participates in selecting topics for unit experiences	4.00 (1.19)	4.21 (0.98)	3.82 (1.08)	3.04 (1.20)	3.09 (1.56)	3.06 (1.39)
Participates in developing unit plans	4.00 (0.94)	4.15 (0.83)	3.72 (1.04)	2.60 (0.91)	2.87 (1.41)	2.89 (1.39)
Participates in gathering books and resources for units	4.75 (0.52)	4.85 (0.36)	4.76 (0.54)	4.20 (0.91)	4.62 (0.71)	4.40 (1.04)
Participates in carrying out unit plans	3.93 (1.05)	4.06 (1.05)	3.43 (1.00)	2.64 (1.15)	3.19 (1.39)	2.87 (1.38)
Participates in assessing unit experiences	3.39 (1.34)	3.60 (1.38)	3.18 (1.23)	2.04 (0.98)	2.38 (1.45)	2.43 (1.42)

As with the items on the role of library media specialist as teacher, the administrators rated the actual practices of the librarian on the instructional consultant items to be lower than the ratings of librarians and teachers on every item.

Reinforcing the image of the librarian as one who helps select unit materials, one respondent wrote that, "The Media Specialist chooses books, films, and any other materials relevant to the unit I am teaching." Open-ended responses did not indicate librarians were participating in lesson or unit experiences beyond being book and materials selectors.

In sum, it can be said that the description of the library media specialist's role according to *Information Power* matches what literacy professionals (teachers, administrators, and library media specialists) believe it should be in the ideal. Likewise, survey respondents

Table 5
Communicating, Cooperating, and Collaborating

Indicate if you have never (1) or regularly (5) used the following ways to communicate during the past school year.	ADM Mean (*SD*)	LMS Mean (*SD*)	TCH Mean (*SD*)
Librarian drops by classroom for brief, unscheduled talk	2.81 (1.13)	3.74 (0.92)	3.07 (1.35)
Teacher drops by library for brief, unscheduled talk	3.92 (1.06)	3.81 (0.88)	3.72 (1.12)
Teacher and librarian meet for unplanned talk in hall, lounge	3.92 (1.02)	4.04 (0.93)	3.76 (1.25)
Librarian seeks out teacher for appointed time to talk	2.96 (1.10)	3.32 (1.11)	2.61 (1.37)
Teacher seeks out librarian for appointed time to talk	3.32 (1.14)	3.15 (1.21)	2.92 (1.33)
Librarian and teacher talk at regularly scheduled planning periods	2.62 (1.13)	2.36 (1.29)	2.17 (1.24)
Teacher sends librarian memos, notes, or other writing	3.81 (1.06)	3.83 (1.17)	3.72 (1.15)
Librarian sends teacher memos, notes, or other writing	3.69 (1.16)	4.17 (1.03)	3.61 (1.24)
Librarian makes announcements at faculty meetings	3.54 (1.42)	3.66 (1.46)	3.[illegible] (1.28)
Teacher makes announcements at faculty meetings	3.54 (1.24)	3.46 (1.47)	3.14 (1.39)
Faculty meeting is devoted to teacher/librarian concerns and interests	2.04 (1.22)	1.94 (1.21)	2.00 (1.28)
Librarian and teacher work together during planning day without children	2.62 (1.20)	2.66 (1.37)	2.34 (1.29)
Teacher leads staff development session in which librarian participates	3.12 (1.28)	2.68 (1.53)	2.23 (1.36)
Librarian leads staff development session in which teacher participates	2.81 (1.44)	2.60 (1.36)	2.34 (1.30)
Teacher and librarian meet to work outside of school day	2.08 (1.26)	2.34 (1.36)	1.68 (1.08)
Teacher and librarian participate in same professional group	2.40 (1.44)	2.23 (1.22)	1.89 (1.29)
Teacher and librarian participate in same staff development course	2.85 (1.52)	3.17 (1.40)	2.56 (1.45)
Teacher and librarian join in action research project	2.31 (1.19)	2.53 (1.33)	1.90 (1.25)

indicated that the library media specialists' actual work approaches, but does not meet, the respondents' ideal view of the role.

Communicating, Cooperating, and Collaborating

If teachers and library media specialists are partners as literacy professionals, how is it that they go about working with each other? Eighteen items were designed to explore answers to this question. The items described possible ways for communicating and working together, and participants were asked to rate how this took place using a 5-point scale ranging from never to regularly. Mean ratings ranged from 2.0 to 3.9 on the 5-point scale with no items at either extreme of the continuum (see Table 5). Standard deviations, however, were high (*SD* ranging from 1.0 to 1.4).

With the exception of the ratings on items about unscheduled talks and sending notes (to which the administrators gave the lowest ratings), the teachers provided the lowest ratings on the items about teacher-librarian partnerships. One of the two lowest rated items across positions had to do with devoting a faculty meeting to teacher/librarian concerns and interests. In sum, responses tell us that teachers and librarians most often work together in informal ways rather than through regular or school-sanctioned activities.

Responses to the open-ended questionnaire reveal a desire to work together in planning and teaching. One respondent wrote, "I would like to see the [research] skills taught in a more concentrated way by our media specialist—with us both discussing and deciding together what is needed." Another said, "It would be helpful if the librarian could sit down with the classroom teachers at grade levels and plan the time the children spend in the library in a way that supports what the children are studying in class."

Supporting Teacher-Librarian Relationships

The final part of the survey also looked at partnerships as it asked what supports or impedes opportunities for teachers and librarians to work together effectively. Thirty-one items were developed to explore answers to this question. Participants were asked to rate the items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 for impeding work to 5 for supporting joint work. Ratings of 3 were used to show the item had no influence on relationships. Mean results across positions indicated high standard deviations (*SD* ranging from .70 to 1.60), again revealing a low consensus on items (see Table 6).

When percent of responses across positions were averaged, the top three ranked items revealed that the librarian's knowledge, personality, and attitudes or interests were most important in supporting good working relationships. The teacher's knowledge, attitude or interests, and personality ranked fifth, sixth, and eighth. The fourth-ranked item stressed the support that adequate books and other resources are to teachers' and librarian's work. Administrator attitude or interest was the seventh-ranked item.

Other items with average ratings of 4 or higher, and therefore supporting partnerships, refer to librarian policies, administrator personality and knowledge, shared beliefs and

Table 6
Supporting Teacher-Librarian Partnerships

What conditions (human or otherwise) impede (1) or support (5) relationships between teachers and librarians?	ADM Mean (*SD*)	LMS Mean (*SD*)	TCH Mean (*SD*)
Planning time during school day	3.17 (1.66)	3.63 (1.53)	2.86 1.51)
Planning time during days without children in attendance	3.78 (1.35)	3.59 (1.51)	3.32 (1.46)
Faculty meetings	3.87 (0.95)	3.70 (1.13)	3.28 (1.21)
Staff development sessions	3.91 (0.79)	3.96 (1.01)	3.63 (1.21)
Adequacy of vehicles for communication	4.09 (0.79)	3.98 (0.99)	3.91 (1.09)
Adequacy of children's books and other resources	4.26 (0.69)	4.26 (1.12)	4.13 (1.00)
Adequacy of nonprint resources	3.75 (1.07)	3.87 (1.33)	3.67 (1.26)
Adequacy of professional books	3.54 (0.98)	3.80 (1.26)	4.04 (0.95)
Adequacy of professional journals and periodicals	3.75 (0.99)	3.89 (1.16)	4.08 (0.91)
Teacher attitude or interests	4.39 (0.72)	3.63 (1.39)	4.41 (0.82)
Teacher knowledge	4.22 (0.85)	3.85 (1.25)	4.35 (0.78)
Teacher personality	4.20 (0.96)	3.67 (1.35)	4.31 (0.86)
Individual teacher policies affecting access, usage, and/or programs	3.92 (0.72)	3.52 (1.38)	3.85 (1.08)
Librarian attitude or interests	4.29 (1.27)	4.50 (0.86)	4.39 (0.89)
Librarian knowledge	4.54 (0.78)	4.54 (0.78)	4.56 (0.73)
Librarian personality	4.50 (1.14)	4.57 (0.81)	4.46 (0.95)
Librarian policies affecting access, usage, and/or programs	3.96 (1.00)	4.33 (0.88)	3.94 (1.21)
Administrator attitude or interests	4.42 (0.65)	4.11 (1.21)	4.00 (1.07)

Table 6. (Cont'd.)

	ADM	LMS	TCH
Administrator knowledge	4.17 (0.82)	3.91 (1.26)	4.00 (1.08)
Administrator personality	4.54 (0.66)	3.87 (1.22)	4.00 (1.05)
Building or district policies on access, usage, and/or programs	3.71 (0.91)	3.53 (1.41)	3.63 (1.09)
State policies affecting access, usage, and/or programs	3.65 (0.83)	3.48 (1.03)	3.32 (1.06)
Curricular and assessment mandates at the building level	3.87 (0.95)	3.48 (0.94)	3.46 (0.96)
Curricular and assessment mandates at the district level	3.71 (0.95)	3.39 (0.93)	3.43 (0.93)
Curricular and assessment mandates at the state level	3.37 (1.10)	3.38 (0.96)	3.34 (0.92)
Beliefs and philosophies related to literacy teaching, learning, programs	3.92 (1.02)	4.09 (0.92)	4.01 (0.97)
Funding at the building level	4.12 (1.23)	3.42 (1.57)	3.28 (1.34)
Funding at the district level	3.92 (1.14)	3.24 (1.60)	3.12 (1.29)
Funding at the state level	3.35 (1.40)	3.11 (1.50)	2.94 (1.38)
Level of parental involvement	3.96 (0.86)	3.20 (1.29)	3.54 (1.16)
Local community attitudes and interests	3.96 (0.95)	3.35 (1.30)	3.44 (1.19)

philosophies, and adequacy of vehicles for communication and of professional journals and periodicals.

In sum, survey responses reveal that people are at the heart of successful working relationships. Funding, curricular mandates, building or individual policies were important, but less so than knowledgeable, personable people with appropriate attitudes and interests.

Responses on the open-ended questionnaire echo the survey results in both positive and negative ways. Most responses sang the praises of the library media specialist. One example of a positive response says, "The library media specialist plays an important part in the reading instruction in my classroom and school. She will certainly be more valuable than ever with the 1995-96 school year because our school

improvement plan will require much from her. She will help to 'improve communication skills with an emphasis on our reading program enhanced with the use of technology.'"

Another respondent who described a librarian as one who "feels as if the library as well as everything in it belongs to her and should not be touched" went on to conclude that, "The principal, teachers, and I (instructional coordinator) have been trying to improve this situation one step at a time; but I am afraid it may take a change of personnel."

When asked what could be done to improve or strengthen programs, respondents often pointed to the need for resources, both human and material. If the school had one library media specialist, respondents wanted another or more help from aides. If the school had only a part-time librarian, a full-time position was called for. In terms of materials, respondents wanted more books of all kinds, more computers, and better access to current technology.

Conclusion and Discussion

Key findings from this survey of library media specialists, teachers and administrators tell us that:

- Literacy professionals place high value on the library media specialist in the roles of information specialist, teacher, and instructional consultant. In other words, they value the role of the library media specialist as it is described in *Information Power*.
- Literacy professionals believe that library media specialists regularly practice the roles of information specialist and teacher.
- Literacy professionals report that the library media specialist is less likely to practice the role of instructional consultant. And when taking on that role, the librarians are most likely to be gathering books and other resources.
- Literacy professionals report using casual rather than systematic ways to work together. Meeting together in regularly scheduled planning periods was not a regular practice.
- Literacy professionals believe that human qualities (knowledge, personality, and attitudes and interests) are most important for supporting good working relationships between teachers and librarians.

In addition to these key findings, I want to note another matter raised by the results of the survey. I believe the survey shows a need to consider the role of the library in promoting and supporting family involvement in literacy.

The last item in the section of the survey on beliefs asks if respondents agree with the statement that "Family involvement enhances literacy development" (see Table 1). The mean rating on that item was 4.90 (SD = .30) with high agreement among teachers, librarians, and administrators. This strongly held belief contrasts with three of the lowest rated items on actual practices.

When asked about the importance of supporting flexible scheduling beyond the school day, the mean rating was 2.81 (SD = 1.73). When asked about the practice of teaching parents how to select and locate books, resources, and information, the mean rating was 3.35 (SD = 1.49). And when asked about the practice of teaching parents techniques for

reading with children, the mean rating was 3.07 (*SD* = 1.39).

According to *Information Power*, supporting and educating families is part of the library media specialist's role. Survey results indicate that we are not regularly calling upon the library media specialist to serve in that role. Obviously, we need to draw attention to this role and act upon our beliefs that families are important to literacy.

One administrator who responded to the survey was most in tune with families and libraries. When asked what could be improved in the library media program, among other points, the administrator asked to, "Open the library 7:30–4:00 instead of 8:00–3:00" and to have "Parents night 2 times a month to check out books or provide programs." I propose we need to learn more about effective programs that involve families and school libraries in supporting young literacy learners.

Before closing, I want to make note of limitations to the study. As with all surveys, respondents in the survey self-select to participate. Selection in this survey was further complicated by asking the library media specialists to take responsibility for distributing the surveys in their schools and for distributing them to teachers who were active users of children's literature. It seems quite possible that respondents to this survey may hold more favorable opinions about the library than do the general population of literacy professionals.

Also, the total number of respondents, 148, is modest. The return rate of approximately 25% is reasonable for a survey with two mailings, but it is not impressive. This suggests surveying a larger population with direct mailings to teachers and administrators.

Further reports along the lines of those from the *Language Arts* issue on libraries also are called for. We need more descriptions of effective library involvement in literacy programs and models for the ways the teachers and librarians might forge strong working relationships.

Dales (1990) calls for establishing "trusting relationships" between teachers and library media specialists. It is my hope that this study's findings about positive perceptions of library media specialists might contribute to such trusting relationships. Knowing that our work is valued can give us the confidence to forge ahead in building trusting relationships.

References

Information power: Guidelines for school library media programs. (1988). Chicago: American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Author.

Barron, D., & Bergen, T. J., Jr. (1992). Information power: The restructured school library for the nineties. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 521–525.

Bell, M., & Totten, H. L. (1992). Cooperation in instruction between classroom teachers and school library media specialists. *School Library Media Quarterly, 20*, 79–85.

Dales, B. (1990). Trusting relations between teachers and librarians. *Language Arts, 67*, 732–734.

Gold, J., Greengrass, L., & Kulleseid, E. R. (1992). Whole language and teacher/librarian partnerships. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 536–537.

Hansen, J. (1987). *When writers read*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hughes, S. M. (1993). The impact of whole language on four elementary school libraries. *Language Arts, 70*, 393–399.

Lamme, L. L., & Ledbetter, L. (1990). Libraries: The heart of whole language. *Language Arts, 67*, 735–741.

Montgomery, P. K. (1992). Integrating library, media, research, and information skills. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 529–532.

Stripling, B. K. (1989). Rethinking the school library: A practitioner's perspective. *School Library Media Quarterly, 17*, 136–139.

Teale, W. (1990). Dear readers. *Language Arts, 67*, 728–730.

Templeton, S. (1990). New trends in an historical perspective: Children's librarians and language arts educators. *Language Arts, 67*, 776–779.

Thomas, J. L., & Goldsmith, A. E. (1992). A necessary partnership: The early childhood educator and the school librarian. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 533–536.

Walker, S. (1988). Information power: The roles of the school library media specialist. *School Library Media Quarterly, 17*, 21–23.

Watkins, J. F., & Craft, A. H. (1988). Library media specialists in a staff development role. *School Library Media Quarterly, 16*, 110–114.

Whitney, K. A. (1988). Information power: An overview—Building library media programs for the future. *School Library Media Quarterly, 17*, 7–10.

Appendix:
The Survey

Notes: The initial section asking for demographic information is omitted because it differed for teachers, administrators and librarians. Also, the survey shows a final numbering of 160 items. There is an error; there are actually 161 items.

BELIEFS ABOUT LITERACY TEACHING, LEARNING AND PROGRAMS

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about literacy teaching, learning and programs. Write a number beside each statement.

1 2 3 4 5

Disagree Agree

____ 1. Reading skills and strategies are best learned through use of materials specifically designed for those purposes - for example, basal readers, phonics kits, etc.

____ 2. Reading skills and strategies are best taught through direct instruction.

____ 3. Reading skills and strategies are best learned while reading children's literature, trade books, library books, for example.

____ 4. Reading skills and strategies are best taught through demonstrations, for example, mini-lessons at the start of a reading workshop.

____ 5. Literacy development is enhanced by reading aloud to children in all grades.

____ 6. Literacy development is enhanced when children discuss their reading with peers and adults.

____ 7. Literacy development is enhanced when reading materials relate to children's interests.

____ 8. Literacy development is enhanced when children choose their own reading materials.

____ 9. Literacy development is enhanced when children have time in school for reading.

____ 10. Literacy development is enhanced when children read voluntarily outside of school.

____ 11. Promoting enjoyment of reading literature is an important goal of a literacy program.

____ 12. Promoting voluntary reading is an important goal of a literacy program.

____ 13. Promoting critical reading and thinking is an important goal of literacy program.

____ 14. Promoting lifelong reading is an important goal of a literacy program.

____ 15. Inquiry methods, activities, and experiences enhance critical reading and thinking.

____ 16. Family involvement enhances literacy development.

BELIEFS ABOUT IDEAL ROLES OF TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS

Please think in terms of "ideals." What should a teacher's role be literacy teaching, learning and programs? What should a librarian's role be? To what extent should they be the same? Different?

Write one number to indicate the importance of the activity in terms of what the teacher's role should be in ideal circumstances. Write another number for the librarian's ideal role.

Please supply ratings for **BOTH** the teacher and the librarian.

1 2 3 4 5

Unimportant Important

Teacher	Librarian		
____	____	17.	Teaches word recognition and vocabulary strategies.
____	____	18.	Teaches comprehension strategies.
____	____	19.	Teaches critical reading and thinking strategies.
____	____	20.	Reads literature aloud to children.
____	____	21.	Shares stories with children through storytelling, puppetry, flannel board, etc.
____	____	22.	Shares stories with children through nonprint media - videos, audiotapes, filmstrips, etc.
____	____	23.	Provides time and space for children to read independently.
____	____	24.	Provides time and space for children to read with buddies or small groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

25. Supports and guides oral response to literature - discussion, book study groups, literature circles, etc.

26. Supports and guides written response to literature, for example, through response journals.

27. Supports and guides dramatic response to literature - choral reading, readers theatre, story theater, etc.

28. Supports flexible scheduling that allows individuals (children and adults) to have access to the library throughout the school day.

29. Supports flexible scheduling that allows individuals to have access to the library beyond the school day.

30. Supports flexible scheduling that allows work in the library by small groups or whole classes of children.

31. Shares books, other resources, and services with children and colleagues (other faculty and staff).

32. Shares information about new materials with children and colleagues.

33. Participates in selecting new materials for the library.

34. Seeks input from children and colleagues when participating in selecting new materials for the library.

35. Makes materials from other libraries, databases, networks, etc. available.

36. Actively seeks and promotes funding for books and other resources.

37. Assists children and colleagues in selecting and locating books.

38. Assists children and colleagues in locating information.

39. Assists children in developing systematic modes of inquiry.

40. Knows needs, skills, interests, and abilities of children.

41. Applies professional knowledge about teaching and learning styles when working with children.

42. Is knowledgeable of the range of children's books and other materials available for readers.

43. Supports flexible policies for use of resources to ensure maximum and equal access for children and colleagues.

44. Uses accurate and efficient systems for locating resources and information.

45. Teaches children how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

46. Teaches colleagues how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

47. Teaches parents and other adults how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

48. Promotes and supports lifelong reading and learning.

49. Promotes and supports critical reading and thinking.

50. Teaches appreciation for the importance of freely available information in a democratic society.

51. Teaches understanding and respect for First Amendment rights.

52. Teaches understanding and respect for copyright, privacy and other laws regarding access.

53. Teaches parents and other caregivers techniques for reading with their children.

54. Participates in designing literacy curriculum and instructional strategies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

____	____	55. Ensures that information skills are integrated into the content areas.
____	____	56. Participates in selecting topics for unit experiences (thematic units, inquiry units, literature units, content area units, etc.).
____	____	57. Participates in developing unit plans.
____	____	58. Participates in gathering books and other resources for units.
____	____	59. Participates in carrying out unit plans.
____	____	60. Participates in assessing unit experiences.
____	____	61. Participates in assessing reading development.
____	____	62. Participates in assessing reading attitudes, habits, interests, preferences, etc.
____	____	63. Plans and promotes programs for voluntary reading for individual children and groups of children.
____	____	64. Participates in assessing voluntary reading.

BELIEFS ABOUT ACTUAL PRACTICES OF TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS

Thank you for sharing your visions of ideals. Now, would you please respond to the same items in terms of what you believe has actually taken place in your classroom, school, and library since the start of this 1994-1995 school year.

Ask yourself - "How often since the start of this school year do you believe teachers (as a whole) have taken or acted upon this role?" How often since the start of this school year do you believe you, the librarian, have taken or acted upon this role?

Please supply ratings for **BOTH** the teachers and yourself.

1 2 3 4 5

Never Regularly

Teacher	Librarian	
____	____	65. Teaches word recognition and vocabulary strategies.
____	____	66. Teaches comprehension strategies.
____	____	67. Teaches critical reading and thinking strategies.
____	____	68. Reads literature aloud to children.
____	____	69. Gives book talks to interest readers in new books and old favorites.
____	____	70. Shares stories with children through storytelling, puppetry, flannel board, etc.
____	____	71. Shares stories with children through nonprint media - videos, audiotapes, filmstrips, etc.
____	____	72. Provides time and space for children to read independently.
____	____	73. Provides time and space for children to read with buddies or small groups.
____	____	74. Supports and guides oral response to literature - discussion, book study groups, literature circles, etc.

75. Supports and guides written response to literature, for example, through response journals.

76. Supports and guides dramatic response to literature - choral reading, readers theatre, story theater, etc.

77. Supports flexible scheduling that allows individuals (children and adults) to have access to the library throughout the school day.

78. Supports flexible scheduling that allows individuals to have access to the library beyond the school day.

79. Supports flexible scheduling that allows work in the library by small groups or whole classes of children.

80. Shares books, other resources, and services with children and colleagues (other faculty and staff).

81. Shares information about new materials with children and colleagues.

82. Participates in selecting new materials for the library.

83. Seeks input from children and colleagues when participating in selecting new materials for the library.

84. Makes materials from other libraries, databases, networks, etc. available.

85. Actively seeks and promotes funding for books and other resources.

86. Assists children and colleagues in selecting and locating books.

87. Assists children and colleagues in locating information.

88. Assists children in developing systematic modes of inquiry.

89. Knows needs, skills, interests, and abilities of children.

90. Applies professional knowledge about teaching and learning styles when working with children.

91. Is knowledgeable of the range of children's books and other materials available for readers.

92. Supports flexible policies for use of resources to ensure maximum and equal access for children and colleagues.

93. Uses accurate and efficient systems for locating resources and information.

94. Teaches children how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

95. Teaches colleagues how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

96. Teaches parents and other adults how to select and locate books, other resources and information.

97. Promotes and supports lifelong reading and learning.

98. Promotes and supports critical reading and thinking.

99. Teaches appreciation for the importance of freely available information in a democratic society.

100. Teaches understanding and respect for First Amendment rights.

101. Teaches understanding and respect for copyright, privacy and other laws regarding access.

102. Teaches parents and other caregivers techniques for reading with their children.

103. Participates in designing literacy curriculum and instructional strategies.

104. Ensures that information skills are integrated into the content areas.

____ ____ 105. Participates in selecting topics for unit experiences (thematic units, inquiry units, literature units, content area units, etc.).

____ ____ 106. Participates in developing unit plans.

____ ____ 107. Participates in gathering books and other resources for units.

____ ____ 108. Participates in carrying out unit plans.

____ ____ 109. Participates in assessing unit experiences.

____ ____ 110. Participates in assessing reading development.

____ ____ 110. Participates in assessing reading attitudes, habits, interests, preferences, etc.

____ ____ 111. Participates in assessing voluntary reading.

TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS:
COMMUNICATING, COOPERATING, COLLABORATING

If teachers and librarians are to carry out their own roles, their joint roles, and support each other, they must have ways to communicate.

Use the following scale to indicate how often you have used the ways itemized below for communicating with each other since the start of the 1994-1995 school year.

1 2 3 4 5
Never Regularly

____ 112. Librarian drops by the teacher's classroom for brief, unscheduled talk.

____ 113. Teacher drops by the library for brief, unscheduled talk.

____ 114. Teacher and librarian meet without planning in the hall, teachers' lounge, etc.

____ 115. Librarian seeks out teacher to arrange for an appointed time to talk.

____ 116. Teacher seeks out librarian to arrange for an appointed time to talk.

____ 117. Librarian and teacher talk at regularly scheduled planning periods.

____ 118. Teacher sends librarian memos, notes, or other written communications.

____ 119. Librarian sends teacher memos, notes, newsletters, or other written communications.

____ 120. Librarian makes brief announcements at faculty meetings.

____ 121. Teacher makes brief announcements at faculty meetings.

____ 122. Entire faculty meeting is devoted to teacher/librarian concerns and interests.

____ 123. Librarian and teacher work together during planning day when children are not in attendance.

____ 124. Teacher leads staff development session in which librarian participates.

____ 125. Librarian leads staff development session in which teacher participates.

____ 126. Teacher and librarian meet to work outside of the regularly scheduled school day.

____ 127. Teacher and librarian participate in the same professional group, a TAWL group, for example.

____ 128. Teacher and librarian participate in the same course for staff development or university credit.

____ 129. Teacher and librarian join in action research project.

SUPPORTS FOR AND IMPEDIMENTS TO TEACHER-LIBRARIAN PARTNERSHIPS

What conditions (human and otherwise) support or impede the ability to achieve ideal working relationships between teachers and librarians as they engage in literacy teaching, learning and programs.

1	2	3	4	5
Impede		No Influence		Support

_____ 130. Planning time during the school day.

_____ 131. Planning time during days when children are not in attendance.

_____ 132. Faculty meetings.

_____ 133. Staff development sessions.

_____ 134. Adequacy of vehicles for communication - oral, written, electronic, etc.

_____ 135. Adequacy of children's books and other print resources.

_____ 136. Adequacy of nonprint (e.g. electronic) resources.

_____ 137. Adequacy of professional books.

_____ 138. Adequacy of professional journals and periodicals.

_____ 139. Teacher attitude or interests.

_____ 140. Teacher knowledge.

_____ 141. Teacher personality.

_____ 142. Individual teacher policies affecting library access, usage and/or programs.

_____ 143. Librarian attitude or interests.

_____ 144. Librarian knowledge.

_____ 145. Librarian personality.

_____ 146. Building librarian policies affecting library access, usage and/or programs.

_____ 147. Administrator attitude or interests.

_____ 148. Administrator knowledge.

_____ 149. Administrator personality.

_____ 150. Building or district administration policies affecting library access, usage and/or programs.

_____ 151. State policies affecting access, usage and/or programs.

_____ 152. Curricular and assessment mandates at the building level.

_____ 153. Curricular and assessment mandates at the district level.

_____ 154. Curricular and assessment mandates at the state level.

_____ 155. Beliefs and philosophies related to literacy teaching, learning and programs.

_____ 156. Funding at the building level.

_____ 157. Funding at the district level.

_____ 158. Funding at the state level.

_____ 159. Level of parental involvement.

_____ 160. Local community attitudes and interests.

Thank you so much for your response.

After this survey is analyzed, we would like to follow up with a brief, open-ended questionnaire to be completed by approximately half of the original survey respondents. If you may be willing to reply to such a questionnaire, would you please provide the following information so we may contact you.

Name _____

School _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone (_____) _____ FAX (_____) _____

E-mail _____

STAPLE SURVEY CLOSED AND MAIL

NRRC National Reading Research Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742